

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF MARYLAND

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,

v.

ROBERT JUSTIN KROP,

Defendant.

Criminal Case No. SAG-24-0174

* * * * *

ORDER

The Court has considered Defendant’s Motion to Dismiss for Lack of Jurisdiction, ECF 53, and Omnibus Motions in Limine and to Dismiss, ECF 54. The Court does not construe these as new motions, the deadlines for such motions having long passed, ECF 29, ECF 34; SAG-23-0123, ECF 109, but rather as the Defendant seeking to establish a clean record and preserve with respect to this matter, SAG-24-0174, and its new indictment the arguments already made in *United States v. Krop*, SAG-23-0123 (“*Krop I*”). The Court views this matter as continuous to *Krop I*, notes that it has already ruled on the issues Defendant now raises in response to prior motions filed by Defendant and his former co-defendant, Charles Jenkins, and incorporates all of those rulings here. ECF 16; *Krop I*, ECF 28, 40, 83, 96, 120.

Defendant’s two new belated motions, ECF 53 and 54, are therefore DENIED for the reasons explained in those prior rulings.

Dated: October 11, 2024

/s/
Stephanie A. Gallagher
United States District Judge